



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,770	11/08/2000	Yin Cheng	003636.0103	9945

7590 04/15/2004
ASHOK K. MANNAVA
281 MURTHA STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304

EXAMINER

HU, JINSONG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

22

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,770

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16,33-46 and 58-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16,33-46 and 58-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 are elected by Applicant for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 33-38, 40-41, 45, 58-65, 67-68 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al. (US 6,247,048).

4. As per claims 1 and 10, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including a method for extracting and reformatting web page content into a format readable on a mobile device [col. 1, lines 7-12; col. 6, lines 16-20], comprising the steps of:

providing a secure connection between a mobile device and a proxy server [410, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 39-52];

generating a user request from the mobile device to the proxy server for

a web page having a first format, wherein the web page resides on an origin web server [420, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 32-36 & 60-64; col. 9, lines 10-12];

forwarding the user request from the proxy server to the origin web server [430, Fig. 4; col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 6; col. 9, lines 13-17];

receiving at the proxy server the web page from the origin web server [440, Fig. 4; col. 7, lines 7-10; col. 9 lines 18-19];

extracting at the proxy server desired content from the web page, reformatting the desired content in accordance with at least one predefined transform [col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 9, lines 24-26]; and

transmitting to the mobile device the desired content using the secure connection [col. 7, lines 20-26; col. 9, line 27].

5. As per claim 2, Greer teaches the step of identifying portions of source code corresponding to the desired content of the web page, wherein the source code is comprised of objects [col. 6, lines 32-36] and creating at least one expression using at least one predefined extraction method, wherein the expression extracts an object referenced in the at least one expression [col. 7, lines 13-19].

6. As per claim 3, Greer teaches the step of storing the reformatted web page in a cache prior to said step of transmitting [col. 7, lines 23-26].

Art Unit: 2154

7. As per claim 4, Greer teaches the step of storing the web page having the first format in a cache prior to said step of extracting [col. 7, lines 11-13].

8. As per claim 5, Greer teaches reformatting is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions for at least two mobile devices having a predefined common characteristic [col. 6, lines 7-8].

9. As per claim 6, Greer teaches the predefined characteristic is least one of a type of operating system, a type of browser, and a manufacturer [col. 5, lines 30-32].

10. As per claim 7, Greer teaches the reformatting step is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions to a particular mobile device [col. 7, lines 13-19].

11. As per claims 9 and 10, Greer teaches the reformatting is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions for a particular web page or all web pages [col. 7, lines 10-19].

12. As per claim 14, Greer teaches the reformatting step comprises at least one of adding meta tag information to a header of the web page, adding a specific attribute and an attribute value to a specific tag associated with the web page, ignoring a previously specified global conversion, inserting text into the web page from a specified file, removing a specific attribute from all tags associated with the web page, removing a

Art Unit: 2154

specific attribute from a specific tag associated with the web page, removing a comments tag from the web page, removing a portion of the content from the web page, removing a specific tag from the web page, removing a specific tag and all the information that appears within the tag from the web page, replacing a first tag associated with the web page with a second tag associated with the web page, setting a specific value of a specific attribute of a specific tag, stopping processing of subsequent reformatting commands, substituting a first sequence of text for a second sequence of text, and removing table formatting [col. 7, lines 26-67].

13. As per claims 33-38, 40-41 and 45, since they are system claims of 1-7, 9-10 and 14, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-7, 9-10 and 14 above.

14. As per claims 58-65, 67-68 and 72, since they are program claims of 1-7, 9-10 and 14, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-7, 9-10 and 14 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

16. Claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (US 6,247,048) as applied to claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 33-38, 40-41, 45, 58-65, 67-68 and 72 above in view of Official Notice.

17. As per claim 8, Greer teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model in Greer's system because it would make the reformatting less complicated by providing the corresponding information of mobile device that can be used as reformat converting reference.

18. As per claims 11-13 and 15, Greer teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach the secure connection is a secure socket layer connection through a gateway. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for secure socket layer connection is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include secure socket layer connection in Greer's system because it would

Art Unit: 2154

improve the security of the system by provide a secure communication path for entire system.

19. As per claims 39, 42-44 and 46, since they are system claims of 8, 11-13 and 15, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 8, 11-13 and 15 above.

20. As per claims 66, 69-71 and 73, since they are program claims 8, 11-13 and 15, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 8, 11-13 and 15 above.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Bellwood et al. (US 6,584,567) discloses a method for server dynamic connection;

Schrader (US 6,587,871) discloses a format convert system;

Fortman (US 6,594,349) discloses a message delivering system;

Liao et al. (US 6,6606,663) discloses a credential caching system;

Fox et al. (US 6,654,786) discloses a information notification system; and

Dutta et al. (US 6,615,212) discloses a content distributing system.

Art Unit: 2154

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax number for Group 2100 is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Jinsong Hu

April 12, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100